

REMARKS

Supplemental Office Action

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing a supplemental Office Action in view of the request thereof.

Amendments

Claim 1 is further clarified in view of a review of claim 14, which recites the option of a coating with an organic-inorganic hybrid polymer where the nanostructure is formed with a mold on the surface of said hybrid-polymer layer. Claim 1 now ever more clearly recites the option of a coating and also the option of directly forming the nanostructure on at least one surface of the transparent optical element, i.e., without a coating.

Additional formality changes have also been made in claim 1.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 10-13 and 22 as allegedly unpatentable over Seiberle in view of D'Amato and Nakano, claims 15, 16, and 19-21 over apparently Sieberle and claim 18 over Sieberle in view of Levy.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the allegation that the references were attacked individually. Applicants' comments were responsive to the allegations and considered the combinations of the references, the motivations for their combinations, the elimination of functions of, e.g., Sieberle, when Nakano is applied as alleged, etc. See the comments provided, for example, throughout page 13 of the last reply. Merely alleging that in view of *In re Keller* applicants improperly argued the rejections, applicants request substantive input on applicants' comments in order to provide a clear record and guidance to applicants as to how to proceed.

The comments on the rejections are incorporated herein by reference from the last response.

Additionally, applicants note that both Nakano and Sieberle disclose an optical surface with a coating where the coating is etched in the processing. See, e.g., claim 23 reciting that the anti-reflective nanostructure is created on the optical surface itself, i.e., without a coating. This saves money and time in processing the finished product, and such is not taught or suggested by the references.

Regarding claim 18, the deficiencies of the primary references are not overcome by Levy. As such, this claim is patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which it depends are patentable.

Reconsideration is respectfully and courteously requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400
Arlington, VA 22201
Telephone: 703-243-6333
Facsimile: 703-243-6410
Attorney Docket No.:PMPD-0002

Date: February 12, 2010